DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 812 TM 005 241

AUTHOR Dobbert, Marion Lundy; Dobbert, Daniel Joseph
TITLE A General Model for Complete Ethnographic Evaluations.
PUB DATE 1 Mar 76
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association (60th, San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Anthropology; Educational Research; *Ethnology; *Evaluation; Guidelines; *Models; *Research Methodology; Systems Approach

ABSTRACT

Rather than arguing for the desirability of using anthropological tools in evaluation, it is assumed by the authors that anthropological tools are desired for certain reasons which they outline. In this article, they aim to systematize their own approach to anthropological-ethnographic evaluation in order that both evaluation agencies and educators may have available a firmly outlined statement which may be used in planning anthropological evaluative approaches, in communication about ethnographic approaches, and judging proposals for anthropological forms of research. This outline is useful for only one of the major models of applied anthropological research, the agency-consultive model. It does not delineate the kinds of additional skills needed to practice action anthropology or research and development anthropology although persons working with either model may find that evaluation is a part of their work. It is hoped that this guide will help anthropogists and supporters of the ethnographic model in evaluation communicate the substance of this endeavor and that it will prove a useful tool in training students in both fieldwork and its application to evaluation. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121812

A GENERAL MODEL FOR

COMPLETE ETHNOGRAPHIC EVALUATIONS

by

Marion Lundy Dobbert; Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Social, Philosophical,
Psychological and Historical Foundations
of Education
College of Education
University of Minnesota

and

Daniel Joseph Dobbert, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor
College of Pharmacy
University of Minnesota

© March 1, 1976

TM005 241

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DANIEL J. DOBBERT

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

ETHNOGRAPHIC MODEL FOR EVALUATION

1. Introduction

The authors of this paper have both used anthropology as an evaluation tool and have come to share a concern for how little it is understood, even by those educators and evaluators who support the use of ethnographic methods. As Everhart (12:206, 208) has recently put it:

> Fieldwork is mystically perceived as a desirable, although admittedly elusive, strategy to counterbalance the rigidity of experimental design. Yet . . . agencies are often unclear about what to expect from fieldwork and the manner in which it fits into the total evaluation effort. I suspect this is so in part because . . . . evaluators (are) trained in psychological research, and thus lack an understanding of the process and product of fieldwork in schools.

If we read the contemporary evaluation currents correctly, the mystical desirability of anthropology rests on three of its basic characteristics. First, anthropology is done on a human scale and its findings are stated in human terms. Our evaluation workshop students, for example, didn't want another set of "meaningless statistics" about such limited aspects of education as reading levels or math skills. They felt that there was much more than cognitive learning occurring in their programs and they want to investigate those other aspects, structural, relational, affective, etc. Similarly, one of us has just commissioned an ethnographic research project aimed at designing a curriculum which produces people-oriented professional pharmacists. A second reason for the attractiveness of ethnographic research stems from the fact that anthropology is inductive and begins with the immediate present of a program. It does not make assumptions about the types of answers it should find; this is especially true if the anthropologist is a traditionalist of the Beattie (4) sort. The inductive nature of anthropology leads directly to its third advantage--anthropologists organize their understandings around

description. Geertz (14) describes this theoretical approach as "thick description". The descriptive theory which characterizes anthropological reporting is understandable and arguable by every person involved in the evaluation situation and thus recommendations stem from bases which are clear to clients.

There is , of course, a fourth reason for accepting anthropological evaluation as desirable, but that reason is not, I believe, recognized outside the field. Anthropology is older as an evaluative endeavor and has a wider history than does psychological evaluation. Applied anthropology has been practiced since around the turn of the century and with great success (13). During this seventy year period applied anthropologists have built up a body of knowledge and principles for analyzing highly complex situations and introducing change into those situations.

It is not our aim in this paper, however, to argue for the desirability of using anthropological tools in evaluation. We assume, rather, that anthropological tools are desired for the reasons summarized above or for other reasons. In this article, we aim to systematize our own approach to anthropological-ethnographic evaluation in order that both evaluation agencies and educators may have available a firmly outlined statement which may be used in planning anthropological evaluative approaches, in communication about ethnographic approaches and judging proposals for anthropological forms of research. The outline presented below was first organized by the anthropologist co-author as a workshop series on anthropological evaluation. It has since been tested in several projects carried out by her students (26, 48).

A systems model of the procedures described here has been published by the authors in Leonard Silvern (ed)., Systems Engineering of Education II (1976). Readers who wish to consult a more precise and detailed description of the evaluation procedure outlined here are advised to consult that work which also includes a simulated use of the procedures.

2. Description of the Procedural Outline

The general procedural outline for ethnographic evaluation which appears as Appendix 1 has five subprocedures. These procedures are based on the ordinary practices of fieldwork and applied anthropology. The first subprocedure (I) guides the client and evaluator in choosing problems which can be profitably evaluated through use of ethnographic methodology. The procedure accepts problems that can be both solved through the discovery of patterns and formulated in terms of ordinary anthropological procedures. The second subprocedure (II) directs the selection of methods which match the problem chosen and leads to the design of a formal research proposal. After the problem has been selected and methodology determined, the actual field investigation gets underway; data from it are gathered, recorded and validated as explained in Section III: Procedures are specified for proper recording. Validation techniques are outlined in detail. As data comes in it is organized and analyzed according to the procedures in Section IV. Major and minor analytic techniques are listed separately with references for some of the less common aspects. Since early analysis uncovers missing aspects of research, aspects of poor recording and contradictions in data the procedures specify that such discoveries must lead to a reformulation of methodology, to the recording of new data and to the application of further validation techniques. After the fieldwork phase is completed the data is further analyzed, and through the procedures in Section V, put into report form. The procedural guide shows how to make the report speak to the problem chosen for evaluation. For this purpose the principles of applied anthropology are carefully systematized. This section of the outline is crucial to success in evaluation. One of the greatest criticisms of anthropological research is that it leaves a client with nothing but an ethnography, a narrative that provides no guide for action.

3. Subprocedures in the Outline

The detailed procedural outline performs several functions. First it systematizes in a compact form the practices of both ethnographic fieldwork and of applied anthropology. Thus it can serve as a field manual for training evaluation oriented fieldworkers and as a checklist for competent practitioners. The use of field manuals to guide data collection has long been common in the field of anthropology (31, 45, 20, 18), but standard manuals for field procedure do not exist. Textbooks on field procedure such as those of Pelto (34) and Williams (47) or carefully selected articles on certain aspects of procedure such as those found in Narroll and Cohen (32) or personal collections from professional journals can serve the purpose of a procedural manual; but just as it is more convenient to refer to a data collection fieldguide than to use outstanding ethnographies as models, so should it be more convenient to carry a procedural manual as a guide to field methodologies. Similarly the principles of applied anthropology may be found in text form in Spicer (42), Goodenough (16) or Clifton (9), among others, and procedural hints for actual practice may be found in Human Organization in such recent articles as those of Peterson (35), Naylor (33), Bernard (5) or Schensul (37). But again a procedural fieldguide is more convenient for both training and checklist use. Further, a field manual can be easily up-dated and added to thus improving with age and preserving the research and application skills gained through often arduous practice. A related purpose which this procedural guide can serve is to permit an anthropologist newly entering the evaluation field a way of checking whether he or she possesses the necessary skills and attitudes for evaluative research. Such a determination is especially necessary because the requirements for making judgments and setting up methods to carry them out are often very different from the requirements for doing non-judgmental fieldwork (5, 35, 37, 40).

Secondly, the detailed procedural outline may be used in explaining to a client what precisely you as a reaseacher will be doing at each step in the work. The amount of time spent can be justified by explaining the procedures required at each level of research. It is expected that advanced explanation will head off some of the common complaints about anthropo gists who hang around doing nothing for months and then disappear with the data for many more months. The evaluating anthropologist could certainly issue progress bulletins based on the procedural outline.

Finally, it is hoped that the existence of a standard procedural manual will make ethnographic forms of research and evaluation more saleable. Clients will be able to examine the process used and will no longer have to buy anthropological help on the basis of its mystic desirability.

The evaluation process begins when a problem is received from a client, in (I.A.). The problem is usually stated in non-specific terms. The procedural outline makes it clear that the major responsibility for the precise definition of the client's problem rests with the anthropologist researcher. On the basis of his/her first discussion with the client some problems may be rejected immediately, while others will be tentatively accepted. If a problem is tentatively accepted the anthropologist will consider its suitability in depth (I.B.)

Specification of suitability is based on the nature of the field of anthropology which may be defined in terms of two historically pre-dominant trends: 1.) Since the turn of the century the primary methodology has been fieldwork. This methodology leads to the first two criteria for suitability. Acceptable problems demand an answer stemming from natural, not experimentally induced behavior (I.B.2.); they are problems formulatable in terms of everyday human experience (I.B.1.). 2.) Interpretation of field data has been concerned with

either culture, mental templates for social life, or social structure, the actual relationships of group life, both of which may be described as patterns. Suitable problems, then, may be answered through discovering and/or comparing cultural patterns. For evaluation purposes, the authors see three particularly useful classifications of pattern each having several subtypes. Problems of diagnosis, monitoring and training which may be defined in terms of functional patterns, ideal patterns, value patterns, historical pattern development or comparison of patterns are judged suitable.

If a problem is found suitable, the researcher may proceed to formulate the research design. This begins with a tentative statement of the research problem (I.C.). By examining the nature of the problem and the specificity of the clients demand the researcher chooses to use either an open or a focused approach and, based on the approach chosen, formulates tentative research questions. Using the formulated questions the researcher now surveys relevant theory and related ethnographic literature, which includes his/her own previous evaluation studies. The researcher then surveys in detail available field techniques and methods reviewing both standard and auxiliary methodologies as listed in (I.C.3.c.i. & ii.).[1] The results of the surveys of theory, ethnographic studies and techniques are used to choose an appropriate theoretical approach to guide research. The question might again be reformulated to match theoretical interests more closely.

At this point the anthropologist considers his/her whole approach in terms of ethical feasibility. Professional standards are consulted (1, 40) and the question is again reformulated to avoid unethical approaches. This completes the background research and the results are integrated into a prelisting of study components (I.C.3.h.). Here the question is broken into an exhaustive list of the components of the problem which then guides the rest of the evaluation

project. Inability to formulate a researchable problem causes the client's problem to be rejected at this point.

The second major procedure (II) is determination of anthropological methodologies usuable to solve the problems listed in the study components. Methological determination utilizes information directly from the prelisted research components along with information from the ethnographic, the methods and the theory survey. Through comparing these three components it may be decided that the researcher is interested primarily in attitudes; so cognitive methods will be selected. Or if the researcher decides to investigate internal politics, he/she might select structure oriented methods, etc. Whatever metholological approach is chosen, it must be used in connection with the basic operational methodologies which are listed in I.C.3.c. Certain basic techniques are always utilized--census, calendar and mapping research. The specific methods chosen are selected to fit practical constraints on money, time and personnel.

Ethical inputs are an important component in the choice of methodology. In subprocedure II.E. six major ethical concerns are excerpted from the periodical literature and from the ethics statements of the American Anthropological Association (1) and the Society for Applied Anthropology (40): 1. & 2.) Doing research secretly or for secret purposes is unethical. Further, current guidelines make secrecy illegal for any research donewith federal money. Informed consent must be obtained of human subjects. Honesty is required as a matter of ethics. Honesty also sets an example to informants from whom the researcher desires honest data. 3.) Any research causes interference and disruption in an institution or a society. The researcher is obligated todetermine that this will not be deterimental. 4.) The researcher must be certain that the methods to be employed don't injure people or manipulate them as mere pawns or tools for obtaining data. 5.) By the same token, he/she must design the methodology so as to avoid using information from one informant as a tool for extracting other needed information. 6.) Finally, because the

researcher benefits from his/her report or publication, the researcher is obligated to pay for benefits received in an appropriate way. In evaluative cases the evaluation report, if done for the people studied, may be sufficient. These limitations determine what methodologies may be chosen.

The actual collection of data is dealt with in subprocedures III. There are two basic aspects of data collection (III. A.), the recording of data as gathered by the methodologies chosen and (III.B.), the validating of the data. As is indicated by III.B.4.h. recording and validating are considered as two sides of the same process. Recording begins with a decision about the level of detail needed based on the aims in each area of study and upon the methodologies chosen. Three possible recording levels are indicated. Since material that is poorly recorded is useless and misleading all data must be immediately reviewed, corrected, and supplemented. The reviewer should check for level of detail, hidden inference and errors. Referencing of notes makes this possible and also contributes to the ease of analysis and organization. The guide offers these and other procedural cautions which help in the production of good recorded data and also indicates that the recording level may be changed as a result of monitoring the data for quality. Very little has been written about recording or quality monitoring techniques in anthropology and persons wishing to learn about them are best advised to consult a professional anthropologist for direction.

Data that has been recorded and quality checked must also be checked for validity and reliability since certainly high quality data about lies, mistakes or odd occurrences will be useless. Meticulous notes are the basis for all data reliability. The writers take the position that data lies in field notes and not in researcher's heads which can forget or slant data over time. The procedural guide also cautions the researcher about his/her own biases which can

invalidate even well recorded data. Four major ways of achieving validity and reliability are dealt with in this subprocedure (III.B.). Three aspects of validation presented in III.B.3. relate to the cross-checking of field data. All data must also be monitored for logic and consistency during the cross-checking process. The guide provides seven questions for diagnosing inconsistencies in data. The guide instructs the researcher to gather new data to solve problems uncovered in the validity check and thus emphasizes again that validation is a process which is on-going during the field work period. Persons wishing to look further into validity with regard to fieldwork should see Viditch (43) for a more sophisticated discussion.

Data is analyzed and organized in subprocedure IV. Recorded, validated data is used in the procedure which requires the researcher to organize and analyze the data inductively. An inductive natural science approach is the hallmark of anthropology (22). When using inductive models, analysis and organization are not separate processes but are two aspects of one process. Analysis is carried out at two levels, the form and content level, for both implicit and explicit patterns which are meaningful to the group being researched.

The anthropological researcher always begins with an inductive process and chooses either the generalized method, here labeled Darwinian, or the specialized ethnoscience method if data was gathered using ethnoscience methodology. The two processes are exactly parallel but the steps are differentially labeled since different sorts of data are processed. Both processes are spiraling and repeated frequently to check data and to move analysis to higher levels. In both cases it is wise to feed the data into a deductive process for checking (IV.B.2.a.). The deductive results control a return to the circular inductive processes. Persons desiring to follow the ethnographic method are encouraged to examine the relevant literature (2, 32) as we have not chosen to present here a detailed model of either of these crucial processes.

Having organized the data inductively the researcher may proceed to organize and analyze in other useful ways. He or she may additionally group facts through probabilities, may analyze pattern linkages (6) possibly using these to construct a functionalist model and may do a content or theme analysis. At this point the methods used to produce the analyzed data are assessed. Difficulty of analysis might stem from faulty selection of research method and necessitate a redesign of method or it might stem from poor data collection and necessitate further collection by better methods. The procedural guide emphasises at this point that some analysis must be begun while the researcher is in the field.

The researcher may, when analytic results are satisfactory, use the results of analysis to construct a model. The modeling process will often occasion further analysis and thus contribute to the rigor of the final report. If a model is done it will also be useful in the evaluation. Further, models can bring to light mistakes in analysis of the data; unsatisfactory, inconsistent models require reanalysis of data.

All analyzed data is next employed in making wide spectrum inference. This analytic procedure may not be omitted as the processes within it are essential to the anthropological approach. The researcher must look at the class, school, training program, or other activity under examination in context of the higher level institutions or networks of which they are a part and in context of the whole culture in which they are set. The researcher must also consider the data in light of educational and cultural transmission research done in both Western and non-Western cultures. This helps him or her to get distance upon the data at hand and to achieve the most general aim of anthropology--to understand the behavior of our species.

When wide spectrum inference is completed, the report can be prepared (V). The process begins with the writing of a narrative description of the actions,

institution or program studied (V.A.). The procedural outline indicates that the anthropological writer reports descriptive data first, excluding his or her own conclusions and inferences. This is essential because it permits the reader to judge the quality of the evaluative aspect of the report. An important part of deciding how to report is in deciding how to limit what needs to be described and discussed. Rules listed for this decision are taken from Gluckman's (15) discussion and are listed in subsystem (V.A.1.). Report form and material to be included in the report are also selected according to the purpose of the report. The various descriptive styles used in anthropological reports are listed and a style is selected to accord with the aims of the report. Any descriptive report should contain sections describing the rationale for the study, its methodology and the context or setting of the institution or group under consideration. This latter section is often partly historical. When the descriptive section of the report is complete, inferences and generalizations based upon the observation data are reported.

The preparation of evaluative aspects of the report (V.B.) is based upon the principles of applied anthropology. We have followed Spicer (42) and Goodenough (16) in modeling this aspect of the work. All evaluative reports will perform pattern diagnosis (B.1.a.). The outline indicates aspects which must be included such as identification of critical social units, critical linkages, buffer persons, biases and malcontents. If the report is strictly diagnostic and no recommendations are required evaluative work is terminated. If recommendations are required the researcher continues evaluative activity and following the principles of applied anthropology recommendations are prepared based on the diagnostic pattern data from the first evaluative step (IV. B.3.). At this point the evaluator should reexamine each important pattern individually in the light of the recommended changes. We have listed

in the outline six important principles of applied anthropology for the examination of affected patterns. Under-analysis at this point will introduce critical weaknesses into the report. The procedural outline next directs the evaluator to an examination of the proposed changes themselves. In this step the evaluator must regard his/her proposed changes as further patterns to be dealt with (see Spicer, 42).

The next procedure directs the researcher towards bridging the gap between what actually exists in the institution and the sought for future states envisioned by the recommendations. Nine specific guidelines are taken from Spicer (42) which enable the evaluator to draw up step by step proposals for achieving change. A final procedure for the detailed analysis of recommendations directs the researcher to delineate possible alternative outcomes for each specific change action suggested. In this step the report should include an estimation of conditions which may lead to the success or failure of the proposed change program. Finally, the report is completed with discussion of its limitations.

However, the report cannot be made public until the necessary ethical constraints have been reviewed. The entire report must be scrutinized to see that it does preserve the anonymity and confidentiality of the informants, to ensure that it will not have undesirable results upon publication and to help the reporter consider what must be reported out of duty to science. These ethical considerations control the nature of the report which must be rewritten to fit them before publication or submission. The researcher must not consider his/her involvement with the evaluation as finished with the submission of the report and if it is possible he/she should attempt to assess the results of the report. Three recommendations (following Peterson) for this assessment are included in the procedural guide. The necessity of this step for the improvement of ethnographic evaluation is self explanatory.

4. Limitations of the Procedural Outline

Anthropology is a very personal science. It relies upon the use of a trained individual as its scientific instrument of research. For this reason most field work reports bear the strong stamp of a personal research style. This procedural outline probably bears just as strong a stamp of our personal styles. Our own orientations, shaped by systems theory and systems engineering, lead us to believe that anything can be systematized which grows out of any sort of a group process, for where there is regularity, even if only statistical, there is pattern. Thus we have undertaken the task, one of us as anthropologist and one of us as a consumer of anthropology, of systematizing the patterns in the practices of field and applied anthropology processes. In the process the field work style crystalized closely resembles the anthropologist authors' ideal (though never achieved) personal style. It is rather a traditional style shaped by the writings of Mead (29, 30) Berreman (6) and Beattie (4). And although the procedural outline owes a great deal to the systematizations of Pelto (34) and of Narroll and Cohen (32) it does not share the scientific hypotheses ideal of the former or the cross-cultural methods favored in the compilation of the latter. Thus we fear that to artistic anthropological traditionalists our formulation will look hopelessly scientific and rigid and that to scientific anthropologists it will look hopelessly unrigorous. We hope, however, that our colleagues will look upon us with kinder eyes and realize that we are trying to take a middle road and present for public consumption outside our own field a modal type of anthropology. In doing this we have followed anthropological precedent and presented a culture by delineating what we judge to be a typical individual.

Our most serious worry in presenting this outline stems from the apparent extreme linearity of process conveyed by the outline form. We regret this, but

the systems model format of our original conceptualization, which conveys the heavily looped nature of anthropological process, is unfortunately not easily disseminated as the paper model is as large as a dining room table and very expensive to print or reproduce. Thus we find it necessary to state here that we do not see anthropological processes as a set of step by step procedures through which one proceeds in only a forward direction. We have attempted to indicate major feedback loops in our outline and in this paper but practicality required restraint.

Finally, this outline is useful for only one of the major models of applied anthropological research, the agency-consultative model (9,32). It does not delineate the kinds of additional skills needed to practice action anthropology or research and development anthropology although persons working with either model may find that evaluation is a part of their work. This bias stems from both the sources used and from the experience of the writers.

Despite these shortcomings we hope that this guide will serve the purposes for which it is intended, that it will help anthropologists and supporters of the ethnographic method in evaluation communicate the substance of our endeavor and that it will prove a useful tool in training students in both fieldwork and in its application to evaluation.

Footnote

[1]The constraints of this paper do not permit the authors to describe these techniques but readers who are not familiar with the use of anthropological methods are urged to consult works like Pelto's Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry (34) and to follow up bibliographic entries for specific techniques of interest.

References

1. American Anthropological Association. "Statement on Ethics," Adopted by the Council of the AAA May 1971.

2. Bateson, Geoffry. Naven (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press) 1958.

3. Beattie, John. "On Understanding and Explanation in Social Anthropology," Brit. Jour. Soc. (1959) 10:45-59.

4. _____. Understanding an African Kingdom: Bunyoro. (New York: Holt, Rinehart 1965.

5. Bernard, H. Russel, "Scientists and Policy Makers: An Ethnography of Communication," Human Organization (1974) 33:261-276.

6. Berremann, Gerald. "Fthnography: Method & Product" in J. Clifton (Ed). Introduction to Cultural Anthropology (Geneva, Ill.: Houghton Mifflin) 1968.

7. _____. Behind Many Masks. (Lexington: Society for Appl. Anthro.) 1962.

8. Birdwhistell, Ray. Kinesics and Context. (Philadelphia: U. of Penn.) 1970.

9. Clifton, James (ed.) Applied Anthropology: Readings . . . (Geneva, Ill.: Houghton), 1970.

10. Dean, John and W.F. Whyte. "How Do You Know If the Informant is Telling the Truth?" Human Organization (1958) 17:34-38.

11. Erickson, Fred. "What Makes School Ethnography Ethnographic." Council on Anthro. and Educ. Newsl., Quarterly. (1973) 2:10-19.

12. Everhart, Robert. "Problems of Doing Fieldwork in Educational Evaluation." Human Organization (1975) 34: 205-215. (Interested readers should consult this special H.O. issue on the ethnography of schooling.)

13. Foster, George. Applied Anthropology. (Boston: Little, Brown) 1969.

14. Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures (New York: Basic) 1973.

15. Gluckman, M. (ed.) Closed Systems and Open Minds (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd) 1964.

16. Goodenough, Ward. Cooperation in Change (New York: Russell Sage Foundation) 1963.

17. Gottschalk, L., C. Kluckhohn, R. Angell. The Use of Personal Documents in History, Anthropology and Sociology (Chicago: Soc. Sci. Res. Council) 1945.

18. Henry, Jules. "Cross-Cultural Outline of Education" Current Anthropology (1960) 1:267-305.

19. _____. Culture Against Man. (New York: Random House) 1963.

20. Hilger, Inez. Field Guide to the Ethnological Study of Child Life. New Haven: HRAF) 1960.

21. Jorgensen, Joseph. "On Ethics and Anthropology." Current Anthropology (1971) 3:321-334.

22. Kimball, Solon. Culture and the Educative Process. (New York: Teachers College Press) 1974.

23. _____and Pearsall. The Talladega Story. (Univ. of Alabama Press) 1954.

24. Langness, L. L. The Life History in Anthropological Science. (New York: Holt, Rinehart) 1965.

25. Levine, Robert. "Research Design in Cultural Anthropology" in Narroll & Cohen #32.

26. Marineau, Catherine "Study of Barrier to Participation in Post-Secondary Education: as Perceived by Adults . . . (Minneapolis: Center for Continuing Education) 1975.

27. Maruyama, Mugoroh. "Endogenous Research vs. Delusions of Relevance and Expertise Among Exogenous Academics" Human Organization (1974) 33:318-322.

28. McEwen, Wm. J. "Forms and Problems of Validation in Social Anthropology" Current Anthropology (1972) 4:155-83.

29. Mead, Margaret. "The Art and Technology of Fieldwork" in Narroll & Cohen #32.

30. _____. Growing Up in New Guinea. (New York: Mentor) 1930.

31. Murdock, George P. Outline of Cultural Materials (New Haven: HRAF) 1961.

32. Naroll, Raoul and R. Cohen. Handbook of Method of Cultural Anthropology. (New York: Univ. of Columbia Press) 1973.

33. Naylor, Larry. "Applied Anthropology: Approaches to the Using of Anthropology", Human Organization (1973) 32:363-370.

34. Pelto, Perti. Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry. (New York: Harper and Row) 1970.

35. Peterson, John. "The Anthropologist as Advocate," Human Organization (1974) 33:311-318.

36. Redfield, Robert. The Little Community (Chicago, U. of Chicago Press) 1962.

37. Schensul, Stephen. "Skills Needed in Action Anthropology . . .," Human Organization (1974) 33:203-208.

38. Silvern, Leonard. Systems Engineering Applied to Education and Training (Dallas: Gulf) 1972.

39. _____. Systems Engineering of Education II . . . (Los Angeles: Educ. and Training Consultants) 1976.

40. Society for Applied Anthropology. "Statement on Ethics" July 1, 1973.

41. Spradley, James and D. McCurdy. The Culture Experience. (Chicago: SRA) 19

42. Spicer, Edward. Human Problems in Technological Change. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation) 1952.

43. Vidirch, A. J. and Shapiro, G. "The Validity of Field Data" Human Organization 13: 20-27.

44. Walcott, Harry. "Criteria for Ethnographic Approach to Research in Schools" Human Organization (1975) 34:111-128.

45. Whiting, John et al. Fieldguide for a Study of Socialization. (New York: John Wiley) 1966.

46. Whiting, Beatrice and J. Whiting "Methods for Observing and Recording Behavior" in Narroll and Cohen - #32.

47. Williams, Thos. R. Field Methods in the Study of Culture (New York: Holt, Rinehart) 1967.

48. Zander, David B. "Explorations of a Community Education Center: Problem Finding, Problem Solving" (Presented at SAA 1976) ms.

Appendix 1

Procedural Outline for the Practice of Ethnographic Evaluation

(c) Marion Lundy Dobbert and Daniel J. Dobbert 1976

I. CHOOSE PROBLEM EVALUATABLE ANTHROPOLOGICALLY

A. Receive request from client

B. Judge suitability of request

1. Select problem requiring human/personal data

2. Select problem requiring observation of natural behavior

3. Select problems answerable through discovery of patterns

a. Accept diagnosis problems which look for patterns

i. Relating to problems vs. smooth functioning

ii. Of values and assumptions influencing behavior

iii. Defining unanticipated outcomes

b. Accept monitoring problems such as

i. Tracing pattern development

ii. Checking the match between implementation and plan

iii. Determining if desired outcomes are achieved

c. Accept training problems

i. Determining patterns of competent practitioners

ii. Comparing trainee and practitioner patterns

4. Reject other types of problems

C. Formulate evaluation research problem (25)

1. Choose research approach

a. Choose an open approach

i. If general information on the whole is desired

ii. To form hypotheses or question

b. Choose a focused approach if problem is specific

2. Formulate some tentative research questions in terms of patterns

3. Do background research

   a. Survey related anthropological theories

   b. Survey related ethnographic studies

   c. Survey available field techniques and methods (34)

      i. Survey standard techniques:

         - Emic methods - ethnoscience, ratings and rankings, semantic differential

         - Non-verbal techniques-kinesic, (8) photography, filming

         - Geneological method

         - Learning local language or jargon

         - Participant observation

         - Analysis of archives, memos

         - Event analysis (23)

         - Systematic observation or sampling (46)

         - Informant useage - life history, interviewing [key informant, ancilary informant, open-ended, structured] (17,24)

      ii. Survey auxillary methods

         - Psychological tests

         - Questionnaires

         - Sociograms

         - Bales Interaction Analysis

   d. Choose appropriate theoretical approach and restate problem

   e. Consider ethical feasibility of using various methods

      i. Consult professional standards (1, 40)

      ii. Formulate research to meet standards

   f. Reject problems which seem undoable or require unethical procedures

   g. Relate background research to tentative questions

   h. List tentative study components and check with client

II. WRITE FORMAL STUDY PROPOSAL

A. Compare theory, method and techniques with client's problem

B. Select several most appropriate methods

1. Consider cognitive methods

2. Consider structure-oriented methods

3. Consider communication-oriented methods

4. Consider multipurpose methods

5. Consider selecting intensive confirmation techniques

C. Include basic methodology

1. Incorporate census research

2. Incorporate calendar research

3. Incorporate mapping research

D. Adjust methodology to meet determined constraints

1. Identify fiscal limitations

2. Identify time limitations

3. Identify personnel limitations

E. Design research to meet ethical criteria (1, 40)

1. Researcher must explain purposes and procedures honestly and get informed consent

2. Clandestine research must be rejected

3. Anticipate results of research interference

4. Manipulation or injury of research population is not permitted

5. Information may not be manipulated to produce leverage

6. Return something of equal value for data received

F. Write proposal incorporating all steps in I and II

III. GATHER DATA

A. Record Data

1. Choose level of information and detail needed in each study area

a. For complete detail record verbatim material

i. Use stenographic notes

ii. Tape record

iii. Film or photograph

b. For moderate detail

i. Use key word reconstruction

ii. Use alternate participation and recording

iii. memorize material for later recording

c. For low level of detail

i. Use count sampling

ii. List categories of happenings or topics

2. Monitor to establish and maintain data quality (29, 34, 46)

a. Check for appropriate level of detail

b. Observe at only one level, macro or micro

c. Check for and remove hidden inference

d. Correct and add to field notes shortly after completing

e. Date time and index notes daily

f. Note state of observer on each note set

g. Record everything of potential value

h. Establish researcher fatigue limits and don't exceed them

i. Return to record further data to correct any problems uncovered in this step

B. Validate data (28)

1. Establish meticulous note-taking standards through quality control

2. Explore and state researcher biases

3. Examine logic and consistency of data

a. Match data with reports of other informants and observers

i. Match with other anthropologists

ii. Match with members of culture observed

b. Match intra-informant data

i. Match statements at widely separated times

ii. Match statements to actions

c. Remember that all informant statements (including lies) are data

i. Explain how of informant statements

ii. Explain why of informant statements

4. Diagnose reasons for discovered inconsistencies (10)

a. Have differing researcher and informant concepts lead to inconsistency?

b. Is there a real ideal conflict?

c. Does inconsistency stem from informant's inability to find a pattern?

d. Is the informant unable to conceptualize the subject?

e. Has the informant generalized from insufficient data?

f. Has the informant failed to report areas in which he/she is not a participant?

g. Does inconsistency result from poor observer memory?

h. Return to record data needed for validation

IV. ANALYZE & ORGANIZE DATA INDUCTIVELY (32)

A. Aim analysis to achieve major ethnographic purposes

1. Analyze for both form and content, explicit and implicit meanings

2. Attempt to explain how and why discovered patterns are meaningful to culture's participants

B. *Select appropriate analytic methods*

1. Select and use inductive processes

a. Employ Darwinian process for most data (22)

i. Using detailed data, categorize by treating some individuals or stimuli as equivalent

ii. Fit categorized data to a conceptual scheme

iii. Use anomalous data to modify or reject conceptualization

iv. Group categorized data into higher level categories and relationships

v. Return to observation data and confirm schema with further data

b. Use ethnoscience process for culture members' cognitive data (41)

i. Seek native categories

ii. Taxonomize categories through inclusion principles

iii. Explain logic of important categories and taxonomies

iv. Return to data and confirm taxonomy and explanation with further data

2. Choose additional appropriate analytic tools

a. Using inductive data construct deductive hypotheses and rework from conclusions to data

b. Characterize data in Bayesian probability terms (32)

c. Construct patterns through pattern linkages such as feature overlap, fussion, complementation and instrumental linkage (16)

d. Do functional analysis

e. Do theme or content analysis

3. Assess research methods use to see if useable analyzable data has been produced, if not decide new methods and gather new data needed

4. If appropriate produce a graphic model of the data (38)

   a. Generate model

   b. Simulate and debug model

   c. Correct anlaysis where shown in error by model

5. Employ wide spectrum inference (11)

   a. Place data in context of next higher levels, show connections

   b. Refer data to a wider cultural context

   c. Employ cross-cultural data to produce insight

   d. Make the familiar look foreign

   e. Refer to the general aims of anthropology

V. PREPARE & SUBMIT REPORT

A. Write ethnographic description

1. Limit report by purpose (15)

   a. Carefully bound problem

   b. Simplify events

   c. Incorporate complex facts without analysis

      i. Abridge conclusions of other sciences

      ii. Make purposely naive assumptions

2. Select anthropological descriptive style (2, 36)

   a. Consider ecological description

   b. Consider structural description

   c. Consider illustrative biography or career as description

   d. Consider comparing, contrasing with well known case

   e. Consider description by ethos or modal personality

   f. Consider world view description

   g. Consider historically oriented description

   h. Consider description as community within a community

3. Prepare descriptive aspects of report

   a. State reasons for study

   b. Describe study's methodology

   c. Describe context or setting

   d. Separate observation from inference to describe community, institution studied

   3. present generalizations or inferences from data (3)

      i. Use concepts from anthropological literature

      ii. Use and define endogenous explanatory concepts (27)

B. Prepare evaluative aspect of report

   1. Answer pattern questions proposed for study

      a. Delineate critical social units

      b. Indicate critical linkages (16)

      c. Identify buffer groups or persons

      d. Describe biases, prejudices, concepts dictating behaviors

      e. Define and describe non-participants or malcontents

   2. If report is diagnostic move to concluding steps (C.F.3.)

   3. If required, prepare and list recommendations

   4. Analyze change recommendations in detail

      a. Apply anthropological change principles to analysis of recommended changes (42)

         i. Delineate values and affects to be touched

         ii. Delineate communication channels to be affected

         iii. Delineate how standing groups will be affected

         iv. Discuss economic and prestige benefits and non-benefits to be produced

         v. Discuss other important traits, complexes affected

         vi. Determine effect of change on organizations, community's outside contacts

b. Examine change reception problems (42)

i. Are patterns of innovator and recipient incongruent?

ii. Do problems exist in the acceptance of the innovator's status, actions that will block otherwise acceptable innovation?

iii. Do recipients fully understand the change?

iv. Delineate lessons to be learned from similar changes in past

c. Specify approaches to successful innovation (42)

i. Contrast desired with present patterns

ii. Identify desired aspects of current situation

iii. Indicate how existing patterns may be utilized

iv. Indicate areas for innovation

v. Specify receptive groups or group members

vi. Indicate methodology for introduction of change which is consistent with the change

vii. Show how to explain the change in recipients' terms.

viii. Recommend ways to involve recipients in change planning

ix. Explain how to make the change process self-completing

d. Delineate possible alternative outcomes of the change processes

C. Discuss limitations of the report

D. Consider ethical restraints upon the report and its use (21)

1. Ascertain that report maintains confidentiality, anonimity

2. Anticipate consequences of publication, take appropriate action

3. Make the research useful to scientific community

a. Publish theoretical discoveries, conclusions

b. Make successes and failures available as learning tool

c. Use report and its results to improve own later work

4. Rewrite report as necessary

E. Submit report

F. Observe and assess results of work (35)

1. Did evaluation enhance client's goals?

2. How did evaluation information change client's actions?

3. Was evaluator's procedure appropriate?

i. Was information supplied when it was timely?

ii. Was information supplied to correct person(s)?

iii. Did client see information as useful?

A systems engineering model of an earlier version of the above appears in L. Silvern, Systems Engineering of Education II (1975).